UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/587,073 | 04/27/2007 | Minoru Ishijima | 2006_1179A | 6947 |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BINDA, GREGORY JOHN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3679 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/29/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/587,073 | ISHIJIMA ET AL. |
| Examiner-induced interview Gainmary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Greg Binda | 3679 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | |
| (1) <u>Greg Binda</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Jeffrey Howell</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 23 March 2010 | Time: <u>2:00 pm</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | nt's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: Yamazaki et al, US 2003/0083135 | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet | RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS | B DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| (A | pplicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to applicant's argument with regard to the drawing objection at item 3 of the previous Office action, examiner asked applicant to explain the relationship between the instant drawings of the disclosed invention. Applicant explained the view at Fig. 7 is a schematic view of the joint in Fig. 6 observed at the open end of housing 10 and that the ball drawn in dashed line in Fig. 7 equates to the uppermost ball 30 in Fig. 6. Examiner pointed out that a similar such schematic view would be no different for the joint at Yamazaki's Fig. 4.

The description of Fig. 7 at pages 11, lines 4+ includes the term "straight travel state of the vehicle". At examiner's request, applicant explained the term refers to the condition of a vehicle that is being steered in the straight ahead direction. It does not refer to the alignment of the inner and outer joint members of the disclosed invention.